arXiv:1212.3100v2 [physics.flu-dyn] 14 Jan 2013

No reactive motion arising from condensation

A. M. Makarieva[1], V. G. Gorshkov[1], A. V. Nefiodov[1],
D. Sheil[2,3,4], A. D. Nobre[5], P. Bunyard[6], B.-L. Li[7]

January 15, 2013

[1]Theoretical Physics Division, Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, 188300, Gatchina, St. Petersburg, Russia; [2]School of Environment, Science and Engineering, Southern Cross University, PO Box 157, Lismore, NSW 2480, Australia; [3]Institute of Tropical Forest Conservation, Mbarara University of Science and Technology, PO Box, 44, Kabale, Uganda; [4]Center for International Forestry Research, PO Box 0113 BOCBD, Bogor 16000, Indonesia; [5]Centro de Ciência do Sistema Terrestre INPE, São José dos Campos SP 12227-010, Brazil; [6]Lawellen Farm, Withiel, Bodmin, Cornwall, PL30 5NW, United Kingdom and University Sergio Arboleda, Bogota, Colombia; [7]XIEG-UCR International Center for Arid Land Ecology, University of California, Riverside 92521-0124, USA.

Abstract

Bannon [2002, J. Atmos. Sci. **59**: 1967–1982] developed equations governing the motion of moist air. These equations include a term for a "reactive motion" that arises when water vapor condenses and droplets begin to fall; according to this term the remaining gas moves upwards so as to conserve momentum. Here we show that this reactive motion is based on a misunderstanding of the conservation of momentum in the presence of a gravitational field. Other suggested means to derive the same expression are shown to be based on an incorrect application of Newton's second law. We conclude that the assumed reactive motion is not compatible with the fundamental physical principles: it does not exist.

1 Introduction

The foundations of meteorology and climate sciences lie in the physical principles that govern atmospheric behavior. Basic physical principles, such as the conservation of momentum, must be correctly understood and applied. Here we identify and explain a key error in one published fundamental equation governing atmospheric motion that has persisted in the literature for a decade.

Bannon [2002] investigated how the Navier-Stokes equations that determine velocity $\mathbf{u}_a$ of moist air

$$\rho_m\Big(\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_a}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{u}_a \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}_a\Big) = -\nabla p + \nabla \cdot \sigma + \rho_m \mathbf{g} \tag{1}$$

(here $\rho_m \equiv \rho_a + \rho_v$, ρ_a and ρ_v are moist air, dry air and water vapor density (kg m^{-3}), p is air pressure, σ is the viscous stress tensor, $\mathbf{g}$ is acceleration of gravity) are modified by the presence of condensate particles in the atmosphere.

Bannon [2002] concluded that condensation causes an additional term $\mathbf{F}_a$ to appear on the right-hand side of Eq. (1):

$$\mathbf{F}_a \equiv \rho_l \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{v}_l \dot{\rho}_v. \tag{2}$$

Here $\rho_l \equiv N_l \overline{m}$ is the density of condensate particles in the air, N_l is the concentration of condensate particles in the air, $\overline{m}$ is their mean mass, $\dot{\rho}_v < 0$ (kg m^{-3} s^{-1}) is condensation rate and $\mathbf{v}_l$ is the mean droplet velocity relative to the air. We shall consider only liquid droplets explicitly without losing the generality of our conclusions.

The second term in Eq. (2) describes an upward acceleration of air upon condensation. Bannon [2002, p. 1972] reasoned the need for this term as a "reactive motion": with the droplets acquiring a downward velocity, the remaining air must gain an upward velocity so that total momentum (air plus droplets) is conserved. Here we shall show that in the presence of a gravitational field this supposed reactive motion contradicts physical principles and does not exist.

2 Misunderstanding the conservation of momentum

Consider the argument for the reactive motion term in Eq. (2). Bannon [2002, p. 1972] discussed a body of mass M that is subjected to no external forces. For an example of such an idealized system, we can take a rocket that moves with velocity $\mathbf{u}_a$ in the absence of gravity. The rocket's motion is reactive: it expels some of its parts that move at a different velocity $\mathbf{u}_l$. The mass of the rocket diminishes at a rate $dM/dt < 0$. Neglecting the acceleration of the expelled fuel/exhaust, $d\mathbf{u}_l/dt = 0$ (cf. the forthcoming Eq. (8)), we can write the momentum conservation equation for the rocket and all of its parts as

$$\frac{d(M\mathbf{u}_a)}{dt} - \mathbf{u}_l \frac{dM}{dt} = 0, \tag{3}$$

$$M\frac{d\mathbf{u}_a}{dt} = \mathbf{v}_l \frac{dM}{dt}, \tag{4}$$

where $\mathbf{v}_l \equiv \mathbf{u}_l - \mathbf{u}_a$. Thus, acceleration of the rocket is proportional to the rate at which it loses mass and to the difference $\mathbf{v}_l$ between the rocket velocity and the velocity of its expelled parts. Equation (4) describes the reactive motion. Its right-hand part is fully analogous to the second term in Eq. (2), while Eq. (4) is equivalent to Eq. (B5.16) ("B" refers to equations of Bannon [2002]).

However, unlike our hypothetical rocket, atmospheric air does not exist in a space devoid of external force – it is subjected to gravity. The conservation of momentum (4) applicable to our rocket+exhaust system is not applicable to the air alone. The Earth's gravitational field is not a detail here: it is central to the process. Unlike the fuel/exhaust that is expelled from the rocket, the newly formed droplets accelerate freely in a uniform downward direction not under some internal process of physical chemistry (e.g., fuel combustion), but under the pervasive influence of the Earth's gravity. Certainly the momentum of the system is conserved but here “the system" includes the entire bulk of the planet Earth. Based on these considerations we conclude that the proposed reactive motion of moist air based on the supposed conservation of momentum of the isolated system (air+droplets) has no physical basis. It does not exist.

3 Examining the derivations of Bannon [2002]

How did the "reactive motion" term arise? Bannon [2002], following the general approach outlined by Crowe et al. [1998], based his derivation on the following key equation (B2.2):

$$\frac{\partial \chi}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\chi \mathbf{u}_\chi) = \dot{\chi}, \tag{5}$$

This equation represents a general conservation relationship for an arbitrary property χ that is transported with velocity $\mathbf{u}_\chi$. Here $\dot{\chi}$ was described by Bannon [2002] as the rate at which property χ is being created within the considered unit volume. A problem with Eq. (5) is that $\dot{\chi}$ remains undefined. For any property χ, one must refer to some relationship (here a physical law) to determine $\dot{\chi}$.

We note that Eq. (5) or (B2.2) is equivalent to Eq. (3.1.16) of Batchelor [1967] with $\chi \equiv \vartheta\rho$ and $\dot{\chi} \equiv Q$ in the notations of Batchelor [1967]. Batchelor [1967, p. 136] specifically mentioned the problem that $\dot{\chi}$ depends on the nature of the considered quantity χ such that no general relationship for it exists.

Intending to apply Eq. (5) for the total momentum of a unit atmospheric volume, $\chi \equiv \rho_m \mathbf{u}_a + \rho_l \mathbf{u}_l$, Bannon [2002] did not specify, discuss or justify any such relationship. He disregarded the problem mentioned by others [Batchelor, 1967]. Instead, he *postulated* that Eq. (5) written for $\chi \equiv \rho_m \mathbf{u}_a + \rho_l \mathbf{u}_l$ is equivalent to the following relationship, see (B5.2) and (B5.7):

$$\rho_m \frac{D\mathbf{u}_a}{Dt} + \rho_l \frac{D\mathbf{u}_l}{Dt_l} = -\nabla p + \nabla \cdot \sigma + \rho_m \mathbf{g} + \rho_l \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{v}_l \dot{\rho}_v. \tag{6}$$

$$\frac{D}{Dt} \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{u}_a \cdot \nabla), \quad \frac{D}{Dt_l} \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{u}_l \cdot \nabla). \tag{7}$$

Here $\mathbf{u}_l$ is the mean velocity of droplets in a unit atmospheric volume. Observing that droplets fall at a nearly constant velocity for most of their lifetime Bannon [2002, (B5.11a)] proposed that

$$\frac{D\mathbf{u}_l}{Dt_l} = 0. \tag{8}$$

Using Eq. (8) in Eq. (6) and comparing Eqs. (6) and (1) we obtain:

$$\rho_m \frac{D\mathbf{u}_a}{Dt} = -\nabla p + \nabla \cdot \sigma + \rho_m \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{F}_a, \quad \mathbf{F}_a \equiv \rho_l \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{v}_l \dot{\rho}_v. \tag{9}$$

Equation (9) is equivalent to Eq. (B5.18). (In the notations of (B5.18) we have $\dot{\rho}_v \equiv -\rho_a \dot{r}_{\text{cond}}$ and $\mathbf{F}_a = \rho_a \dot{\mathbf{u}} \equiv \rho_l \mathbf{g} - \rho_a \dot{\mathbf{u}}_{\text{phase}} \equiv \rho_l \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{v}_l \dot{\rho}_v$, see (B5.18) and (B5.7b).)

Bannon [2002] never discussed the problem of $\dot{\chi}$ being undefined but rather based his derivations on an incorrect postulate.

4 Resolving the contradiction between Ooyama [2001] and Bannon [2002]

Our evaluations help illuminate a related topic: the contradiction between the expressions for $\mathbf{F}_a$ obtained by Bannon [2002] and Ooyama [2001]. The expression obtained by Ooyama [2001] does not contain the reactive motion term. While the contradiction is recognised [Bannon, 2002, Cotton et al., 2011], the implications remain uncertain.

Ooyama [2001] assumed that in the presence of condensate the equation for the motion of moist air contains an additional term $\mathbf{F}_a$ that describes the rate of momentum transfer from the droplets to the air:

$$\rho_m \frac{D\mathbf{u}_a}{Dt} = -\nabla p + \nabla \cdot \sigma + \rho_m \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{F}_a. \tag{10}$$

Likewise, the equation for the motion of droplets contains, following Ooyama [2001], an additional term $\mathbf{F}_l$ that describes the rate of momentum transfer from the air to the droplets[1]:

$$\rho_l \frac{D\mathbf{u}_l}{Dt_l} = \rho_l \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{F}_l. \tag{11}$$

Without addressing the nature of this momentum exchange, Ooyama [2001] assumed that they represent *internal* interactions within the considered atmospheric volume and cancel out when Eqs. (11) and (10) are summed[2]:

$$\mathbf{F}_a = -\mathbf{F}_l. \tag{12}$$

Summing Eqs. (11) and (10) in the view of (12) yields

$$\rho_m \frac{D\mathbf{u}_a}{Dt} + \rho_l \frac{D\mathbf{u}_l}{Dt_l} = -\nabla p + \nabla \cdot \sigma + \rho_m \mathbf{g} + \rho_l \mathbf{g}. \tag{13}$$

As one can see, Eq. (13) differs from Eq. (6) of Bannon [2002] in that in the former the reactive motion term is absent. If Ooyama [2001] had assumed, as did Bannon [2002], that $D\mathbf{u}_l/Dt_l = 0$ (8), his expression for $\mathbf{F}_a$ would have been $\mathbf{F}_a = \rho_l \mathbf{g}$, cf. (10) and (13)[3].

---

[1] See Section (6) for a discussion of this equation.

[2] We plan to examine this equation elsewhere – its validity does not impact our conclusions here.

[3] To be accurate we note that Ooyama [2001] made a slightly different assumption, $D\mathbf{v}_l/Dt_l = 0$, which was presumed to reflect no change of terminal velocity along the droplet path. Accordingly, his expression for $\mathbf{F}_a$ in (10) became $\mathbf{F}_a = \rho_l \mathbf{g} - \rho_l D\mathbf{u}_a/Dt_l$. This detail is not however relevant to the reactive motion problem.

Thus we can see that the controversy between the derivations of Ooyama [2001] and Bannon [2002] is resolved. It results from the incorrect equation (6) of Bannon [2002].

5 An alternative derivation of the reactive motion term

One anonymous referee[4] suggested a procedure to derive Eq. (2) without the problematic Eq. (5). Here we will show that this proposed derivation is also based on a physical error and cannot be justified. The referee started by noting that Newton's second law for a particle of mass M and velocity $\mathbf{u}$ has the form:

$$\frac{d(M\mathbf{u})}{dt} = \mathbf{f}_{ext}, \tag{14}$$

where $\mathbf{f}_{ext}$ represents all external forces acting on the particle. Observing that in a continuous medium the momentum is defined as $\int \rho\mathbf{u}d\tau$, where ρ is density and $d\tau$ is an elementary volume of moving fluid, the referee presumed that Newton's second law, by analogy with (14), can be written as:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int \rho\mathbf{u}d\tau = \mathbf{f}_{ext} \equiv \int \mathbf{F}_{ext}d\tau, \tag{15}$$

where $\mathbf{F}_{ext}$ is the external force per unit atmospheric air volume.

Noting that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int \rho\mathbf{u}d\tau = \int \rho\frac{D\mathbf{u}}{Dt}d\tau + \int \mathbf{u}\Big(\frac{D\rho}{Dt} + \rho(\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u})\Big)d\tau, \tag{16}$$

see Eq. (3.1.11) of Batchelor [1967], taking into account the continuity equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\rho d\tau) = \dot{\rho}d\tau \ \text{ or } \ \frac{D\rho}{Dt} + \rho(\nabla\cdot\mathbf{u}) = \dot{\rho} \tag{17}$$

and assuming that Eqs. (15) and (16) are valid for any $d\tau$, they derived the following equation from Eqs. (16) and (15):

$$\rho\frac{D\mathbf{u}}{Dt} = \mathbf{F}_{ext} - \dot{\rho}\mathbf{u}. \tag{18}$$

Writing Eq. (18) for the air ($\mathbf{u} \equiv \mathbf{u}_a$, $\rho \equiv \rho_m$) and droplets ($\mathbf{u} \equiv \mathbf{u}_l$, $\rho \equiv \rho_l$) yielded:

$$\rho_m\frac{D\mathbf{u}_a}{Dt} = -\nabla p + \nabla\cdot\sigma + \rho_m\mathbf{g} + \mathbf{F}_{fa} - \dot{\rho}_v\mathbf{u}_a, \tag{19}$$

$$\rho_l\frac{D\mathbf{u}_l}{Dt_l} = \rho_l\mathbf{g} + \mathbf{F}_{fl} + \dot{\rho}_v\mathbf{u}_l, \tag{20}$$

Here $\mathbf{F}_{fa}$ and $\mathbf{F}_{fl}$ are the friction forces exerted by the droplets on the air and vice versa, respectively. These forces exist independent of condensation.

---

[4] See details here.

By summing Eqs. (19) and (20), taking into account that $\mathbf{v}_l \equiv \mathbf{u}_l - \mathbf{u}_a$ and assuming that $\mathbf{F}_{fa} = -\mathbf{F}_{fl}$ the referee obtained Eq. (6) of Bannon [2002].

The error here is that Newton's second law in the form (14) only applies for *constant mass systems* where $dM/dt = 0$. In the general case of bodies with variable mass the correct form of Newton's second law is

$$M\frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt} = \mathbf{f}_{ext}. \tag{21}$$

Similarly, in the dynamic Euler and Navier-Stokes equations (1) density ρ in the $\rho D\mathbf{u}/Dt$ term is not under the sign of differentiation irrespective of whether ρ is variable (including possible changes because of condensation) or constant. The fundamental dynamic equations based on Newton's second law are the equations on velocity, not momentum. For momentum, there are no dynamic equations, that is, no equations defining $\dot{\chi}$ in Eq. (5) for χ representing momentum. For momentum, there is only the law of momentum conservation.

In the view of Eq. (21), equation (15) is only valid when the mass of the fluid with velocity $\mathbf{u}$ is conserved, i.e. when $\rho d\tau$ is constant over time and $\dot{\rho}$ in Eq. (17) is equal to zero. In this case Eq. (18) corresponds to the fundamental Euler or Navier-Stokes equation. When $\dot{\rho} \neq 0$, Eq. (18) as well as the subsequent derivations are invalid.

The incorrect application of Newton's second law by using the form (14) in cases where mass is not fixed is surprisingly common. It has been discussed in journal articles as well as in textbooks: for details we refer the reader, for example, to Plastino and Muzzio [1992] and references therein. As a brief illustration of the absurd unphysical results that follow from Eq. (14) when mass is changing, consider a block of ice of mass M that is melting in a warm room, $dM/dt < 0$, in the absence of net external forces, $\mathbf{f}_{ext} = 0$:

$$M\frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt} = -\mathbf{u}\frac{dM}{dt}. \tag{22}$$

Since velocity $\mathbf{u} = 0$, we have from (22) $Md\mathbf{u}/dt = 0$: no acceleration, the ice block remains motionless on the table. Consider now the same piece of ice travelling in a train that moves with constant velocity $\mathbf{u} \neq 0$. Then we obtain from (14) that $Md\mathbf{u}/dt = -\mathbf{u}dM/dt \neq 0$. This means that the ice block accelerates within the train because of melting. This absurd result (non-invariance of acceleration in different inertial frames of reference) illustrates the flawed logic behind applying Eq. (14) to systems with changing mass. We note that Bannon [2002] followed the same incorrect logic. His unnumbered equation in the right column on p. 1972 is identical to Eq. (22). He also confused Eq. (22), which has the same velocity $\mathbf{u}$ on both sides of the equation, with Eq. (4) for reactive motion, where the velocities are different.

Another example of unphysical results stemming from Eq. (15) at $\dot{\rho} \neq 0$ is given by Eq. (20). Indeed, this equation, derived by the referee, contradicts the commonly used equation of motion for droplets, where the $\dot{\rho}_v \mathbf{u}_l$ term is normally absent. Specifically, Eq. (20) contradicts Eq. (B5.8a) borrowed by Bannon [2002] from Pruppacher and Klett [1997].

6 The motion of condensate particles

We could stop our analysis here. However, it may be instructive to analyze what considerations could motivate the derivations like that of Bannon [2002] that start from formulating the conservation equations (5) for total momentum. Such derivations could be undertaken to determine the links between the movement of air and of droplets and to describe the exchange of momentum between them. Indeed, the continuity equations for water vapor and liquid,

$$\frac{\partial \rho_v}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho_v \mathbf{u}_a) = \dot{\rho}_v, \tag{23}$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho_l}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho_l \mathbf{u}_l) = -\dot{\rho}_v, \tag{24}$$

seemingly tell us that condensation turns water vapor that moves with velocity $\mathbf{u}_a$ into liquid droplets that move with mean velocity $\mathbf{u}_l \neq \mathbf{u}_a$. As a consequence, the change of total momentum appears to depend on condensation rate $\dot{\rho}_v$ and on the difference in velocities $\mathbf{v}_l \equiv \mathbf{u}_l - \mathbf{u}_a$. However, as we have discussed, such an exchange of momentum does not in fact take place.

Motion of any particular droplet is described by the linear equations of Newton's second law; it is independent of the presence of other droplets. For this reason there cannot be any non-linear dynamic equation for the mean velocity $\mathbf{u}_l$ of droplets in a unit volume. (In contrast, for air such a non-linear equation does exist: it is the Euler equation.) With no dynamic constraints on $\mathbf{u}_l$, the continuity equation for droplets (24) that includes the undefined $\mathbf{u}_l$ becomes meaningless. Any physical inferences drawn from this equation are potentially misleading. We will now prove that the non-linear dynamic equation (11) for condensate particles is incorrect.

Consider a flux of macroscopic particles (raindrops, hailstones, etc.) that do not interact with each other contained within a fixed volume. We can define the mean velocity $\mathbf{u}_l$ and mean acceleration $\mathbf{a}_l$ of particles as

$$\mathbf{u}_l \equiv \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{u}_{li}}{n}, \quad \mathbf{a}_l \equiv \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{a}_{li}}{n}, \quad \mathbf{a}_{li} \equiv \frac{d\mathbf{u}_{li}}{dt}. \tag{25}$$

Here n is the number of particles in an arbitrary small volume V enclosing the considered point, $\mathbf{u}_{li}$ and $\mathbf{a}_{li}$ are velocity and acceleration of the i-th particle.

Clearly, Eq. (11) should be consistent with Newton's second law governing the motion of particles. For a droplet of mass m_i it reads:

$$m_i \mathbf{a}_{li} = m_i \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{f}_{li}. \tag{26}$$

Here $\mathbf{f}_{li}$ is the force exerted by the air on the i-th droplet.

Summing (26) over n considered particles and dividing the sum by volume V we obtain:

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i \mathbf{a}_{li}}{V} = \rho_l \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{F}_l, \;\; \rho_l = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i}{V}, \;\; \mathbf{F}_l \equiv \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{f}_{li}}{V}. \tag{27}$$

Force $\mathbf{F}_l$ (27) represents the cumulative drag force exerted by the air on all droplets in a unit air volume. Comparing Eqs. (27) and (11) we find that Eq. (11) can be obtained from Eq. (26) only if the following non-linear relationship holds:

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i \mathbf{a}_{li}}{V} = \rho_l \left[\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_l}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{u}_l \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}_l \right] \equiv \rho_l \frac{D\mathbf{u}_l}{Dt_l}. \tag{28}$$

We will now show that Eq. (28) does not generally hold for a flux of particles. We will consider the simplest case when all the particles have the same mass, $m_i = m$ and $\rho_l = nm/V$. Eq. (28) then reduces to

$$\mathbf{a}_l = \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_l}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{u}_l \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}_l \equiv \frac{D\mathbf{u}_l}{Dt_l}. \tag{29}$$

For the purposes of our demonstration we divide the particles in the flux into two arbitrary types with respect to dynamics: e.g., let us colour these types green and red. As the particles do not interact, the flux of green particles is not affected by the presence of red particles, and vice versa. Thus, if (29) were generally true, it must apply to the red and green fluxes separately as well as to the combined flux.

Mean velocity $\mathbf{u}_l$ and mean acceleration $\mathbf{a}_l$ of the flow as a whole (red+green) are

$$\mathbf{u}_l = \alpha \mathbf{u}_{l1} + \beta \mathbf{u}_{l2}, \;\; \mathbf{a}_l = \alpha \mathbf{a}_{l1} + \beta \mathbf{a}_{l2}, \;\; \alpha + \beta = 1, \tag{30}$$

where α and β are the relative numbers of red and green particles in the total flow, $\mathbf{u}_{lk}$ and $\mathbf{a}_{lk}$ (25) are the mean velocity and acceleration of green ($k = 1$) and red ($k = 2$) particles, respectively.

Let relationship (29) be satisfied separately for both types of particles, i.e. the following is true for $k = 1, 2$:

$$\mathbf{a}_{lk} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}_{lk}}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{u}_{lk} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}_{lk}, \;\; k = 1, 2. \tag{31}$$

Putting (31) and (30) into (29), we find that (29) only holds for the combined flow if

$$([\mathbf{u}_{l1} - \mathbf{u}_{l2}] \cdot \nabla)(\mathbf{u}_{l1} - \mathbf{u}_{l2}) = 0. \tag{32}$$

This is true if either $\mathbf{u}_{l1} = \mathbf{u}_{l2}$ or $\nabla \mathbf{u}_{l1} = \nabla \mathbf{u}_{l2}$. These conditions apply only when all particles possess the same velocity.

Such conditions do not hold in a precipitating atmosphere where some droplets are already falling at near terminal velocity and others have only begun to form and have near zero motion with respect to the surrounding air. Droplets of the first type have approximately zero mean acceleration $\mathbf{a}_{l1} \approx 0 \ll \mathbf{g}$, while droplets of the second type have acceleration $\mathbf{a}_{l2} = \mathbf{g}$. Condensation produces droplets of the second type only and thus does not change the total momentum per unit volume. Moreover, at their instant of forming having zero velocity with respect to the air, the newly formed droplets do not impose any force on the air. Therefore, $\mathbf{F}_a$ cannot depend on condensation rate and formula (2) must be incorrect.

Finally, let us consider the situation with condensate particles having one and the same velocity. Condensation occurs at height $z = h$ only. Consider a droplet that arises from condensation at time $t = 0$ and starts falling. Eq. (26) in this case has the form (we omit indexes l and i):

$$a \equiv \frac{du}{dt} = -g + \frac{f}{m}. \tag{33}$$

Location Z of the droplet on its trajectory depends on time t as

$$Z = h + \int_0^t u(t')dt', \quad \frac{dZ}{dt} = u(t), \quad dt = \frac{dZ}{u(Z)}. \tag{34}$$

Changing variables from t to Z in (33) with use of (34) we can re-write Eq. (33) as

$$a = u\frac{du}{dZ} = -g + \frac{f}{m}, \quad \frac{d}{dZ}\frac{u^2}{2} = -g + \frac{f}{m}. \tag{35}$$

Eq. (35) follows from the linear equation (33) and represents the law of energy conservation. Non-linearity of Eq. (35) appeared when t was replaced byy z in (33). Coordinate $Z = Z(t)$ in (35) describes the position of droplet on its trajectory and is unambiguously determined by the dynamics of the droplet (33) and time t.

If force f acting on a droplet at point $Z(t) = z$ is time-independent, all droplets forming at $z = h$ will have one and the same velocity $u(z)$ at point z. There will be a stationary spatial distribution of particle velocity $u(z)$ (even if condensation rate and, hence, particle density vary in time). We can see that in this case Eq. (29) is fulfilled taking into account that $\partial u/\partial t = 0$. On the other hand, if force $f(z)$ depends explicitly on time, then particles formed at different times can have different velocities at point z. In this case, particles with different velocities can be present at any point z, which, as we have shown, makes Eq. (29) invalid.

7 Conclusions

Recently Cotton et al. [2011] reflected upon the fundamental equations describing moist atmospheric dynamics. They concluded that the reactive motion term described by Bannon [2002] was of potential importance and warranted further study. Cotton et al. [2011] offered various graphical illustrations explaining how the phenomenon is manifested. Here we have shown that this reactive motion term was based on a physical error. It does not exist.

References

P. R. Bannon. Theoretical foundations for models of moist convection. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 59:1967–1982, 2002.

G. K. Batchelor. *An introduction to fluid dynamics.* Cambridge University Press, 1967.

W. R. Cotton, G. Bryan, and S. C. van den Heever. Fundamental equations governing cloud processes. *Int. Geophys.*, 99:15–52, 2011.

C. C. Crowe, M. Sommerfeld, and Y. Tsuij. *Multiphase Flows With Droplets and Particles.* CRC Press, 1998.

K. V. Ooyama. A dynamic and thermodynamic foundation for modeling the moist atmosphere with parameterized microphysics. *J. Atm. Sci.*, 58:2073–2102, 2001.

A. R. Plastino and J. C. Muzzio. On the use and abuse of Newton's second law for variable mass problems. *Celestial Mechanics and Dynamical Astronomy*, 53:227–232, 1992.

H. R. Pruppacher and J. D. Klett. *Microphysics of Clouds and Precipitation.* Kluwer, 1997.